

forced to spend the major portion of her time and her work in an insanitary house is the victim of the landlord's greed and the carelessness of the city fathers in allowing "light and air, like porterhouse steaks, to come too high for poor people." But we do seem to be making some progress.

An instance of about as nasty, inethical and, indeed, even dishonest a piece of business as could well be imagined has recently come to our attention. Whether the particular occurrence cited is unique or whether the evil is one of any considerable extent it is not possible to say; we can only hope that there are very few such rascals in the medical profession. A certain physician was called in consultation by a family who had for a regular attendant their lodge doctor. Suggestions were made by the consultant that were well accepted and for a time the patient improved. Changes were again made, without consulting the consultant, and the patient failed somewhat, so that the family telephoned for the consultant. He replied that he could have nothing to do with the case unless he were to be again called in by the regular attendant. The family insisted upon a consultation and the family physician called in another consultant—not the first one. After more or less discussion and communicating back and forth, the original consultant, who had been well liked by the family and whose suggestions seemed to have been of benefit to the patient, was insisted upon by the family and was reluctantly called in again by the family physician, who thereupon confessed, very frankly, to the consultant that he had objected to his being recalled into the case because said family physician always expected to have the consulting physician divide his fee with him! What a nice mess! Truly, it is about the limit of impudence and open, utter dishonesty. That the division of surgical fees goes on all the time and everywhere, seems to be generally conceded, though its dishonesty is evidenced by the secret manner in which it is done and the unwillingness of any of the participants to such a transaction to let the fact be known. But that the same type of dishonesty should have extended itself into the domain of consultation fees, is indeed a surprise and a shock. What hope is there of combating the contract and dollar-a-month evil when one has to do with such rotten ethics and such gross disregard of common honesty in the individual? Such a thing is no more and no less than stealing, and to fail to call in a consultant who may be of the greatest benefit to the patient, is not much less than criminal. Can any of our members report other instances of this outrageous practice? If any readers know of such cases will they please communicate with the editor? The names will not be used but the facts should be known.

At the last meeting of the State Society the By-Laws were amended by adding a section to one of them which provides for the election by each component society, of a corresponding editor, whose duty it shall

#### CORRESPONDING EDITORS.

be to send in scientific editorials, items of interest, notes, etc., for the JOURNAL. This can be made a very valuable and attractive feature of the JOURNAL if those elected as corresponding editors will but take an active interest in their work. It is proposed to set aside a sufficient number of columns for this special matter, giving a list of corresponding editors at the top, and giving credit for the material sent in. Of course, as the amendment provides, all such matter submitted shall be subject to the approval of the Publication Committee, just the same as anything else submitted for publication. The opportunity is now presented for every county society to co-operate more actively in the JOURNAL and to let the other counties know just what is going on in its territory that will be of interest to others in other parts of the state. But like a good many things, it is very largely up to the individual counties and the editors they elect, to produce results. No general editor and no publication committee can do this work; if it does not come voluntarily from the properly qualified corresponding editors, then it will not appear in the JOURNAL. As yet no county societies have sent in the name of the corresponding editor, but there has not been sufficient time since the meeting.

Schemes innumerable there are for separating money from people. One is again reminded of the historic, if unflattering remark of a New York Police Inspector when he raided the establishment of a notorious "sure-thing operator": "Preachers, doctors and lawyers are the easiest suckers there are." Pay so much and you have your name in large type in the telephone book. But what earthly good does it do you? Did you ever hear of any physician who ever got a patient because his name was in large type in the classified end of the telephone book? Comes also the man with the "physicians' blue book" or red book or black book and says, pay so much and we put your name in large type and we will say almost anything about you that you like. It is just advertising, plain and simple, and the worst kind of advertising because it does not pay. It is very doubtful if ever a doctor got a patient from having his name in display type in these things; they are just methods of separating Mr. Easy from a few of his dollars; and furthermore, they are advertising methods that are not exactly just the thing that the real high grade, self-respecting physician adopts. But then, "Preachers, doctors and lawyers are the easiest suckers there are."

#### TUBERCULOSIS SUNDAY.

April 24th was celebrated throughout the United States as Tuberculosis Sunday. On this date, from the majority of pulpits a sermon was preached upon the dangers of tuberculosis, general methods of pre-